relatives, and also that the emendation of *Cotile* to *Cotyle* was justifiable on philological grounds.

WITHDRAWAL OF THE ABOVE APPLICATION

By R.K. Brooke

Dr Mees has kindly sent me a copy of his comment on my application concerning *Cotyle* Boie, 1826, and both he and Mr Melville have elucidated various aspects of the question in correspondence. It is quite clear that *Cotyle* is a deliberate but unjustified emendation of *Cotile* Boie, 1822, and therefore must have the same type-species, *Hirundo riparia* L. This is the most obvious view to take of the two quotations from Boie that Dr Mees gives, and the quotation from Gray fully supports this. Sharpe & Wyatt's 1894 designation of *Hirundo fucata* Temminck as type-species was both unnecessary and invalid. Since there is, in fact, no nomenclatural problem, there is no cause for the Commission to consider this application further.

COMMENTS ON REQUEST FOR A DECLARATION MODIFYING ARTICLE 1 SO AS TO EXCLUDE NAMES PROPOSED FOR DOMESTICATED ANIMALS FROM ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE. Z.N.(S.) 1935.

(see vol. 27: 269-272; vol. 28: 77-78, 140; vol. 29: 108)

(1) By Colin P. Groves *(Department of Prehistory & Anthropology, The Australian National University, P.O. Box 4, Canberra A.C.T. 2600, Australia)*

The thoughtful comments evoked by my proposal (Groves, 1970) deserve an equally thoughtful reply. I cannot forbear to note, however, that of the commentators none, with the possible exception of Eisenmann, works closely with animal groups which have given rise to domesticated forms, so that they cannot be altogether expected to appreciate the full ramifications of a situation which requires some guidance on its nomenclatural procedures, but on which the present Code is silent. Among specialists on such groups, not one as far as I know is satisfied with the prevailing limbo. In my original application *(Bull. zool. Nomencl.* vol. 27: 269-272) I quoted Bohlken and others; most recently Clutton-Brock et al. (1976) have expressed a similar dissatisfaction because they "believe that formal zoological nomenclature should be avoided in naming domestic animals" (:142). If specialists follow the lead of Clutton-Brock et al., as is likely, then we will be faced with a situation where the Code is simply flouted: not intrinsically desirable, surely, and while it may or may not lead to annoyance among these specialists it will cause endless confusion among the hordes of non-specialists who nevertheless have occasion from time to time to refer in a scientific context to domestic animals.

The case of the canary, quoted by Eisenmann (1972) is one which I had not appreciated; evidently the solution to the problem - "did Linnaeus intend